THEOLOGY

VOL. LVI AUGUST, 1953 No. 398

Editorial

NOTHING much has been written, so far as we know, about the idea of holding periodical "missions" in or to universities. It seems to have become almost a convention in most British universities that at more or less triennial intervals a mission should be arranged. It would be easier to decide whether the convention is a good one if more information were available about the way it works. We should like to have an historical account of the origin, development, and varieties of the university mission. We should like to have a social scientist's survey and analysis of the methods and of the observable effects of a number of missions in different universities. What types of student attend missions? What impression do they consider the experience has made on them? etc. We should like to see an outspoken attack on the holding of university missions, perhaps on the ground that they distract students from their studies and other proper employments, or perhaps on the ground that they delude the Christians into supposing that they are making the word of God audible in the whole university, or to those of its members who have had no previous dealings with the Church, when in fact all they are doing is to make it rather more audible to themselves. We should also like to hear of an alternative missionary strategy for the Church in the university: a university counterpart to *Revolution in a City Parish*.

There is very likely much still to be said for what has become the standard pattern of university missions: we mean the introduction of an outside team of speakers, by one or more of whom a central course of addresses is given, the rest being available for smaller meetings, interviews, and informal discussions in colleges, hostels, and faculty societies, etc. All who have had to do with such missions will agree that almost everything depends on the preparatory work that is done during the two years before the actual mission week, and also on the way the enterprise is followed up. Those with wide experience also appear to agree that the standard kind of mission *as a rule* touches only those students who have some previous grounding in the Christian faith or some previous association with a Church: it does not make any real impression either on the totally indifferent or on the definite unbelievers, who may be comparatively few in number but are often more alive intellectually and otherwise than the majority of students.

Before future university missions are planned, those concerned might do well to ask whether the energy and effort they entail might not be better employed in a sustained endeavour to encourage and equip Christian students to take the fullest possible part in all the so-called secular areas of university life, instead of concentrating as much attention as the keen ones are inclined to do on overtly re-

ligious activities and religious societies. After all, the Christian mission to a university ought to be going on all the time, and the people charged with the mission are all the Christians in the university day by day, and not a few missioners from outside who are occasionally imported. If the word of God is to become audible to the unbelieving, let alone to the indifferent, their interest will first have to be aroused by an indirect method, and it looks as though some new approach to the idea of the university mission would be worth considering.

The Fathers in English, and the Revival in Patristic Studies

THE last few years have seen first a trickle and now something like a flood of translations of Church Fathers into English. There have, of course, been earlier floods—in the 1840s, the Oxford Library of the Fathers, then the Ante-Nicene Christian Library beginning in the 60s, and later the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers in two waves starting in 1886 and 1905 respectively. During the interval of half a century, scholars all over the world have been fruitfully engaged in patristic studies, in connexion particularly with questions of Church history and history of doctrine. So it has come about that, as with Scripture, so with the Fathers, the critical approach has laid bare new points of significance, while the cumulative effect has been to discover a wealth of interest in patristic writings hidden from their earlier readers.

Often the best way for an English-speaking scholar to pursue the study of a patristic text is to render it carefully into English. He can hardly miss, if he does this, points that call for investigation. And when he has made his notes on these, he will have gained a conspectus of the work, its authorship, setting, and significance. He thus has what is wanted as introduction to his rendering, and will easily supply such notes as are useful alike to scholars and to the reader who comes to the subject without previous knowledge. A good example of such work carried through to publication is Mr C. R. B. Shapland's *Letters of St Athanasius concerning the Holy Spirit* (Epworth Press, 1951). This book is primarily a vehicle for conveying to scholars the fruits of critical study. At the same time it enables the educated general reader to understand something of the mental struggle of fourth-century Churchmen to honour and confess rightly the Third Divine Person. It is to be hoped that the sale of such individual publications has justified the belief of publishers that there is a market for new translations of the Fathers.

The question now is of translation into the English idiom of today, with introduction and notes not primarily, or even at all, written for the purpose of communicating new knowledge, but rather to aid the general reader who lacks the linguistic equipment for reading the works of the Fathers in the original, and yet wants to know what they wrote about and to gain an intelligent idea of their

message. Few educated people to-day have any such grounding in Greek or Latin as was common with their counterparts of a generation or two ago. On the other hand, modern education has familiarized us all with the historical approach to almost every subject. Here is a gain that may in part offset the loss. It should mean that there are to-day, among the serious reading public, many hundreds who will not rest satisfied with a dictionary article, or with such outlines as can be culled from some standard work of Church history, if they have the means to "get the feel" of early Christian life and thought from direct reading of the early Christian writers. And this requires that they should have them Englished. So there is a great opportunity for those who have the qualifications for rendering this piece of public service.

At the present juncture no less than three new libraries of translations are on their way through the press. The first of the three, of which thirteen volumes are here under review, is the series *Ancient Christian Writers*, edited by Dr J. Quasten and Dr J. C. Plumpe of the Catholic University of America in Washington. In this country, publication is by Longmans, Green and Company, at the price of 25s. a volume, comparable in size and shape with the volumes of the Oxford Library of the Fathers, though with a third less pages, and a considerably smaller average of words to the page. Though the series is under Roman-Catholic auspices, some volumes are being entrusted to scholars who are not Roman-Catholics.

There is announced a second American Roman-Catholic series, under the editorship of Dr Roy Deferrari, bearing the title *Fathers of the Church*. There is also, as was pointed out last month in THEOLOGY, beginning to appear a series of twenty-six volumes entitled *The Library of Christian Classics*, of which nine volumes will be given to selected patristic writings.

Lest it should be supposed that such publications are the sole evidence of a new interest in the Fathers, mention should be made of the International Conference on Patristic Studies held at Christ Church, Oxford, in September 1951. This conference, due to the enterprise of Professor F. L. Cross, and having its germ in some conversations held in France a little while previously, proved a success beyond all expectations. It was attended by over 300 scholars, of whom just under half were Roman Catholics. The program included a very large number of papers, at which attendance was remarkable and discussion (as far as time permitted) eager and profitable. The concord of interest that prevailed throughout could not have been surpassed had all the participants been of one ecclesiastical allegiance. In fact, confessional difference seemed to be forgotten. Scotch Presbyterians and Irish Jesuits, Scandinavian Lutherans and French abbés, were to be found engaged together in the objective discussion of patristic problems in one another's college rooms. And the secret of so remarkable an event seems to be that the approach to the Fathers which all the conference members were following was in some degree new. Their predecessors in patristic study, from the sixteenth century to the nineteenth, turned to the Fathers largely with

polemical aims. They sought in the Fathers support for the doctrine or order of their own confession, and particularly for such doctrine or order as was in dispute. By contrast, the communications made at Oxford sought, with singleness of purpose, to make the Fathers more intelligible for their own sakes. Approached in this way, the Fathers grow in intellectual stature, the varied interest of their works is revealed, and the students working on them are insensibly drawn into intellectual sympathy and mutual confidence. That this Oxford occasion was no "flash in the pan" appears from a recent announcement of an Augustinian Conference to be held at the Institut Catholique at Paris in September 1954. It thus appears that the patristic interest is in the ascendant among scholars, so that there is no lack of men qualified to meet the demand which the publishers anticipate for the Fathers in translation.

It is time to return from this digression to review the thirteen volumes so far to hand of the series *Ancient Christian Writers*. In format the volumes are uniform, eschewing footnotes and marginal references. Introduction and translation are printed attractively on pages unbroken by small type, where the only interruption of the text is by little numerals referring the reader to notes printed in sequence in the later part of the volume. Seeing that half the numerals refer simply to a Bible reference, a heavy price has thus been paid, from the reader's point of view, for clearing the margins and eliminating the footnotes. For the reader has to keep his thumb in the notes, and must be always turning backwards and forwards from his reading of the text. The answer to the question *Cui bono?* is clearly the printer, and considering the times in which we live, it is decisive. Nevertheless, the reader might be spared much fatigue if the editor directed the use of leaded numerals in the text whenever the reader really ought to consult the note before proceeding.

The work in all the volumes under review is of high quality. The introductions are good and the renderings are at once scholarly and readable. Of course, there would, for the most part, be little excuse for mistranslations, since most of the works have been Englished before, and often very well. And even where older translations were faulty, they have provided the new translator with something with which to stimulate his vigilance.

The part of the work most open to comment is the notes. It is a question for general editors what kind of notes should be provided to these popular translations, and what principles should guide the inclusion and omission of matter. The scholar, writing for scholars, leaves out nothing that is relevant to his theme. The Ph.D. candidate is apt to put in everything that can, by any stretch of the imagination, be thought relevant. But neither is the best model for a translator who designs to serve the general reader. What he *must* put in his notes is clear. Whenever the reader, for lack of knowledge of circumstances to which the author tacitly alludes, may not take in the significance of what he has written, the translator must, in a succinct note, supply the needed information. If the author's argument is obscure, or the sequence of his thought hard to trace, it is for the

translator to come to the rescue. But he should be moderate in his references to other literature, and eschew questions that do not impose themselves. He does best to consign works in foreign languages to the bibliography. The general reader does not want page-references to *Studien* or *Beitraege*. On the other hand, if references have been assembled that might prove of value to other scholars, they can well find a place at the end of a note, where the general reader can skip them.

In translation there is one point that is easily overlooked. The translator's own knowledge of the original is apt to make him overlook ambiguity in his English rendering. The best way to make this point clear is to take an example. Father Davis, translating St Gregory the Great, *On Pastoral Care*, says (p. 68): "For often some persons, forgetting that they are superiors of their brethren for the sake of their souls, devote themselves with all concentration of heart to secular cares." This is no mistranslation. But the reader may be doubtful what sort of persons, whose souls, or what manner of secular cares, are meant. But this situation can be avoided by recourse to a somewhat freer rendering. "For often prelates, forgetting that it is for the good of their brethren's souls that they are set over them, concentrate too heartily on caring for their secular needs" would seem to give the sense of the sentence without ambiguity.

It would be out of the question, in this article, to attempt twelve separate reviews of as many undertakings, covering Clement of Rome, Ignatius, the Didache, etc., Tertullian (Treatises on marriage), Arnobius (*Against the Pagans*) in two volumes, Athanasius (*Life of St Antony*), Augustine (four volumes of selections), Prosper (*The Call of all Nations*), Gregory the Great (*Pastoral Care*), and Julian Pomerius. But to avoid keeping entirely to generalities, a very brief review of one volume (and that the shortest) may be given, with some remarks on some other volumes. The shortest volume is Dr R. T. Meyer's *Life of St Antony* (Introduction 13 pp., translation 82 pp., notes 36 pp., index 16 pp.). The rendering is lively and interesting, and leans towards the colloquial ("a tidy lump of money"). The notes are sensible and good (if incompletely proof-read). But Dr Meyer's attitude to the demonology of St Antony, briefly expressed on page 13 in the words "There is quite too much of it", is a defect. He might have recognized that the "enthusiasts" (*spoudaioi*) of Antony's age were men who felt that, by their faith, they were routing those who had brought about the "deceit of idols" (paganism), namely the demons. And Antony's demonology is nothing less than a Coptic Christian philosophy. Viewed in that light, it makes sense of what were otherwise a crazy story. Antony starts as one of the "enthusiasts" living, for religion's sake, in huts built at some remove from the village. On ceasing to be content with this, he transfers himself to the village cemetery, and goes from thence to an abandoned fort, deep in the desert. His aim was not so clearly to find solitude with God, as (like Charles de Foucauld) to carry the standard of Christ into the "dry places" where the demons "walk". It was an uncovenanted reward that in fact Antony there sloughed off the demonic from his

own nature, and regained the gift of paradisiacal innocence, so as to become the initiate of divine mysteries. The calm, courageous, genuine life that Antony attained, he attained as warrior against demons. His war was, no doubt, quite as wholesome a war as that of the Greek Alexandrines warring against their own passions, being less introvert. And the *Life* is full of insights, as when Antony discerns restlessness and inconstancy to be the *idiomata* of demons, in contrast with the peace of heart and the steady purpose granted to the servants of God. There is much, therefore, to which Dr Meyer is insensitive. And he passes over some interesting minor issues, like that raised in Section 90, of the right treatment of the dead bodies of Christians. These observations suggest the reflection that, in assigning works to translators, there is a gain in getting for each work not merely someone competent to translate, but, if possible, someone who has already steeped himself in all the circumstances of the work he is to translate. Something of the same feeling of a fortuitous assignment is created by Father P. de Letter's treatment of the *Call of all Nations*. After Dom Cappuyns, he argues in favour of the attribution of this work to Prosper of Aquitaine. But having done this, he shows little appreciation of Prosper's achievement, in collecting and ordering everything in Scripture that can throw light on the paradox of God's dealings with man's free-will, or the skill with which he shapes his argument to decry all addition of human speculations to revealed truth. Nothing could better allay the storm of controversy over the Semipelagians. Father de Letter seems always to be measuring Prosper's arguments against the standard of "what we believe to-day" (Note 21 on p. 174). What that standard is, the reader is supposed to know. There is only, at this point, a reference to Denziger's *Enchiridion*. The reader might, indeed, go away with the impression that Prosper made a rather unsuccessful contribution to Catholic polemic, and one having very slight interest for to-day. At the same time, he ought not to do so. For he has here, for the first time, this work translated into English, and if he reads with thought and attention there is no reason why he should not find for himself the deep interest of Prosper's latest work.

Professor McCracken's two volumes of Arnobius are full of learning likely to be of most interest to those who could read Arnobius in Latin. It would be an indomitable "general reader" who should go right through the *Case against the Pagans*. The Professor notices St Jerome's story that Arnobius was required to produce his work before being accepted for baptism, but does not remark the piquancy of the Bishop of Sicca's expedient in making this "rhetoric-master turned inquirer" first purge himself of his old stock-in-trade, before setting out on the road that leads to baptism.

Dr J. A. Kleist had the hard task, in his two volumes of Apostolic Fathers, of covering once again ground so often traversed already. It is an advantage that his emphasis is Roman Catholic, as is his choice of literature to which to refer. For this very reason he will be read with the more interest and profit by those of his readers who are not Roman Catholics. Though one may not agree that Clement of

Rome was "familiar with the whole New Testament" or that the Didache was composed in the first century, one may yet find Dr Kleist thoroughly worth reading, savour his translation, and enjoy his sane enthusiasm for St Ignatius.

Nothing need be said of the volumes of Tertullian, Gregory, and Pomerius, but that they are soundly done, though the last named is not very inspiriting in his English dress. Perhaps that is partly his fault. Of the Augustinian volumes, the *Christmastide Sermons* and *Against the Academics* give us matter that is not easily available in English, although Dr O'Meara, who translates the latter, mentions two American versions of it, published in the '40s. The remaining two volumes are *The Greatness of the Soul* and *The Teacher*, and *The Sermon on the Mount*.

That this opening broadside of *Ancient Christian Writers* should be, taken altogether, so good is very encouraging. The series deserves a wide public, and can do much good in stimulating and nourishing Christian thought.

To this survey of translations should be added a notice of another development in the field of patristics which affords a most impressive testimony to the extent of the present revival. Work has been going on in Belgium for the last four years to launch a new edition of the Greek and Latin Fathers, under the title *Corpus Christianorum*. It is hardly a happy inspiration to call it "the new Migne", and yet that expresses what it is in scope. A first fascicule is now to hand. It contains the bibliography and tables of the volume devoted to Tertullian, a five-page edition of *Ad martyras* by Dom E. Dekkers, and one of sixty-four pages containing the two books *Ad nationes* edited by Professor J. G. P. Borleffs. The publishers are Brepols of Turnhout, who invite subscriptions. A leading principle of the new edition is condensation of apparatus. This calls for clear and full explanation, which has been provided by the publication of a *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, containing an introduction to all the texts in the Latin series, which indicates the best existing editions, most important manuscripts, and other aids to the critical determination of readings. The Tertullian fascicule begins with twenty pages of bibliography bearing on all the works of Tertullian, a chart of the manuscript descent of the Cluniac *corpus Tertullianum*, three folders of *Testimonia* showing all references by Christian writers of antiquity to works or parts of works by Tertullian, and a fourth folder that gives a conspectus of the works contained in the principal codices and early editions.

The *apparatus criticus* at the foot of the text is designed to assemble, in a minimum space, a key to the whole enormous body of evidence now available to the student. Thus for *Ad martyras* are shown the readings preferred by the seven earlier editions, together with those presented by five important late manuscripts not previously collated. Where a reading has other support, this too is indicated in a shorthand form not difficult to decipher. The two books *Ad nationes* survive only in the eleventh-century Codex Agobardinus. Accordingly, the apparatus in this case is chiefly concerned to

assemble clues to the available opinions of scholars on doubtful readings, together with suggested emendations. The student thus has the means, so long as he has access to an adequate library, of finding everything that is in print which may help him to determine what Tertullian actually wrote. And the laconic indications that make this possible are a monument of learning, labour, and ingenuity.

Considering what is rendered to us in this small fascicule, and then thinking of the 175 projected volumes in the Latin series, of which not a few will be at least the first editions worth the name, with the corresponding Greek series still to come, it is clear that a new era of patristic study may be just beginning, and that Christendom may again drink deep from the springs of spiritual wisdom that rise nearest to Holy Scripture.

W. Telfer.

Is the Incarnation Unique?

A COSMOLOGICAL SPECULATION

At the end of his posthumously published work *Modern Cosmology and the Christian Idea of God*, Professor E. A. Milne has raised an interesting question for dogmatic theology. He states it as follows:

> "God's most notable intervention in the actual historical process, according to the Christian outlook, was the Incarnation. Was this a unique event, or has it been re-enacted on each of a countless number of planets? The Christian would recoil in horror from such a conclusion. We cannot imagine the Son of God suffering vicariously on each of a myriad of planets. The Christian would avoid this conclusion by the definite supposition that our planet is in fact unique. What then of the possible denizens of other planets, if the Incarnation occurred only on our own?"[1]

As Milne himself remarks, "we are in deep waters here, in a sea of great mysteries. But", he continues, "the way out is not fantastically improbable"; and he goes on to suggest a solution.

> "Everyone has heard of the new subject of radio-astronomy, which has discovered the reception by ourselves of radio-signals apparently issuing from sources in the Milky Way. It is not outside the bounds of possibility that these are genuine signals from intelligent beings on other 'planets', and that in principle, in the unending future vistas of time, communication may be set up with these distant beings. . . . If that is so, there is no prima facie impossibility in the expectation that first of all the whole solar system, secondly our own group of galaxies" (may we perhaps interpolate "lastly, the whole intergalactic universe"?) "may by inter-communication become one system. In that case there would be no difficulty in the uniqueness of the historical event of the Incarnation. For knowledge of it would be capable of being transmitted by signals to other planets and the re-enactment of the tragedy of the crucifixion in other planets would be unnecessary."[2]

Before discussing the question in detail, it seems to be desirable to point to certain phrases which, in spite of the brevity of his statements, seem to indicate clearly that there was, from the standpoint

---

[1] Op. cit., p. 153. [2] Ibid.

of the Christian theologian, a deficiency in Milne's understanding of the Atonement. Whatever he may have considered to be the inner significance of the Passion of Christ considered in itself, it appears that for Milne the necessary and sufficient condition for it to be effective for the salvation of God's creatures is that they shall *know about it*. Whatever may be the biological character of such corporeal rational beings as the universe may contain, if they can be given the good news that the Son of God became incarnate in the human species and that, living a life of perfect love and obedience, he gave himself to the extreme extent of suffering death on the Cross, this may be expected to evoke a response of gratitude which will break down any barrier of sin that is separating these creatures from God. Such would seem to be the view of redemption that underlies Milne's suggestion. It is in sharp contrast with the attitude of the great classical tradition of Christian thought. For the latter, the essence of redemption lies in the fact that the Son of God has hypostatically united to himself the nature of the species that he has come to redeem and, by offering himself to God the Father in their nature, has offered them to God the Father in him; and, although of course it would not be maintained that this redemption operates, as it were, automatically in all the members of the human race by the mere fact that the Son of God has lived and died as man, it would be maintained that it operates in them by their incorporation into that human nature in its risen and ascended glory and by their co-operation with the grace that this incorporation brings. By dying and rising again in human nature, Christ has reunited human nature to God; and in so far as we are partakers of his human nature we are restored in him. The Son of God became man in order that, in him, men might become the sons of God; that is the Christian message as we find it in the New Testament and the Fathers, and as the great tradition of Christendom has held it. On it depends the whole doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ, and of the Sacraments as Christ's acts in his Body. Admittedly it has commonly been held that the ultimate effects of redemption extend beyond the human race to the material creation as a whole; but this is because man has been generally looked upon as the only corporeal rational being in the universe, to whom in the beginning the rest of creation was subjected as to God's vice-gerent, and to whom it is once again subjected in the assumption of manhood by the Son of God. It would be difficult to hold that the assumption by the Son of the nature of one rational corporeal species involved the restoration of other rational corporeal species (if any such exist) which were not hierarchically graded beneath the first but were co-ordinate with it. Christ, the Son of God made man, is indeed, by the fact that he has been made man, the Saviour of the world, if "world" is taken to mean the world of man and man's relationships; but does the fact that he has been made man make him the Saviour of the world of non-human corporeal rational beings as well? This seems to me to be doubtful; I shall return to this point later on.

There is a second remark of Milne's which suggests a deficiency in

his view of the Atonement, namely his remark about "the tragedy of the crucifixion". His suggestion seems to be that the notion of the crucifixion of the Son of God is so horrible that, while we can just manage to bring ourselves to stomach the fact of its having happened once on Calvary, the thought of its repetition elsewhere in the universe is altogether impossible to entertain. I find this suggestion extremely difficult to understand. There is, of course, an aspect of the crucifixion which is ghastly beyond words, and I do not wish to belittle it. But the whole message of Christianity is that the supreme horror of the crucifixion of God incarnate has been transformed by his resurrection into the supreme glory of the redemption of the human race. If the crucifixion is sheer unrelieved horror, how can we tolerate the notion of its happening even once? If the horror is not unrelieved but is changed into victory and glory, why cannot the change happen again and elsewhere? Indeed, the very phrase "the tragedy of the crucifixion" is one which a Christian theologian would employ only with considerable reservations. *Regnavit a ligno Deus.* The tragedy of the Cross, it has been well said, is the tragedy not of God but of man; and we may add, it is the mystery of man's redemption. For Christianity, the history of the world is not a tragedy but, as Dante so accurately named it, the Divine Comedy. Milne's remark about the tragedy of the crucifixion confirms the suspicion that he appears to have looked upon redemption as consisting simply in the response of God's creatures to the news of God's love, rather than in the incorporation of them into God's redeeming activity; it would only be natural on such a view to emphasize the horror of the crucifixion, in order to stimulate the soul to penitence and amendment of life.

The suggestion which I wish to make, with all the tentativeness that is proper to a matter about which we are in almost complete ignorance, is that there are no conclusive *theological* reasons for rejecting the notion that, if there are, in some other part or parts of the universe than our own, rational corporeal beings who have sinned and are in need of redemption, for those beings and for their salvation the Son of God has united (or one day will unite) to his divine Person their nature, as he has united to it ours, and has done (or will do) in it whatever is necessary for their restoration to fellowship with God, as he has done what is necessary for ours. I am, of course, aware that this possibility has not been seriously entertained by the great Christian theologians of the past, but that is surely because they have never seriously considered the possibility that the universe may contain corporeal rational beings other than man. Their failure to do so, however, seems to me to rest not primarily upon theological but on scientific grounds; so long as the science of their day saw no grounds for assuming the existence of non-human rational inhabitants of the material universe, we can hardly wonder that the theologians saw no grounds for assuming it either. It is unfortunate that when the possibility of a plurality of rational species has been taken into account by theologians in recent years it has generally been by theologians whose Christological and soteriological outlook was very far from

that of Christian tradition.[1] The only conclusive theological objection that I can imagine is one that would arise from a view of the Incarnation which, although it has enjoyed a brief period of popularity, represents a complete departure from Christian tradition and is now very much on the decline; I mean the extreme kenotic view. If, in accordance with this view, we held that between his incarnation and his ascension the Son of God temporarily abandoned, to a greater or less degree, his divine attributes, and that during that period his divine nature was, as it were, scaled down to the limits of manhood, it would certainly be difficult to hold that an incarnation could take place *simultaneously* in two different parts of the universe. For, if incarnation means limitation to a particular place, all other places are *ipso facto* excluded; the Son of God could no more be in two places at once than any of us can. Moreover, it would seem to be just as difficult to conceive of incarnations taking place in different parts of the universe at *different* times. For even the most extreme kenoticist would hold that, after the Ascension, the Son is permanently established in his heavenly glory; and this would make any further incarnation, conceived on the kenotic model, altogether impossible. These objections, conclusive as they are on a kenotic view, seem, however, to have no force for a traditional orthodox Christology. If the Incarnation of the divine Word involves no change in the Godhead, if the transcendence of the Creator over his creation is such that he can assume a finite nature to himself and in it can live a creaturely life without any abandonment of his divine activity and attributes—if, in short, in the words of the *Quincunque vult*, the Incarnation takes place not by the conversion of the Godhead into flesh but by the taking up of manhood into God, there seems to be no fundamental reason why, in addition to human nature being hypostatically united to the Person of the divine Word, other finite rational natures should not be united to that Person too. If finite and infinite natures are compatible in the Person of the Word, there seems to be no reason why several finite natures should not be equally compatible. To suggest this possibility is, it must be emphasized, totally different from suggesting that God might become incarnate on more than one occasion in the *same* rational nature—that, for instance, Socrates and Gautama Buddha might, equally with Jesus of Nazareth, be incarnations of the divine Word. The Word became man by assuming a human nature which had no personal individuality of its own, and, in assuming it, he conferred his personal individuality upon it; if *per impossible* he assumed, and conferred his personal individuality upon, human nature twice over, there would not after all be two individuals but only one; which is simply a paradoxical way of saying that in fact human nature could not be assumed by the divine Word more than once, since it is individualized in his Person and that Person is numerically one. We may make the point less metaphysically in the following way. The divine Word assumed human nature in order to renew and restore it, and,

[1] Cf. E. W. Barnes, *Scientific Theory and Religion*, pp. 323 f., 401 f.

having renewed and restored it, he offers renewal and restoration to every member of the human race by incorporation into him. There is nothing that a second incarnation in human nature could achieve that has not been achieved by the first. All men are called to become members of Christ's Body by being incorporated, as men, into his manhood and, being so incorporated, are offered as one Man to the Father. But the very possibility of this incorporation depends upon the fact that they are *men* and Christ is *man*, that he has taken upon himself their nature. It will not in the least degree follow that rational beings of a *non-human* species can be incorporated into his manhood. If redeemed men are all one man in the Word-made-man, we may expect that redeemed martians (if there are martians and they are not human[1]) will be all one martian in the Word-made-martian; and this would seem to require an incarnation of the Word in martian nature as its foundation. But all this is, of course, speculative in the extreme, since we know nothing about the nature of such beings, not even whether they exist.

It is, of course, quite possible that human beings are the only rational beings within the material realm (we know, of course, that there are non-human rational beings in the realm of pure spirits). In 1938 the late Sir Arthur Eddington was prepared to admit that there might be "a few rival earths dotted here and there about the universe", but felt "inclined to claim that *at the present time* our race is supreme".[2] Whether in fact we consider the conditions which have made the earth a possible home for living creatures to be unique or not will largely depend on whether we consider the earth's formation as being, from the point of view of physics, a freak occurrence or not; and this is extremely difficult to determine in view of the multitude of competing theories of the earth's origin. Dr W. M. Smart, in his recent book *The Origin of the Earth*, lists no less than nine alternative views of the formation of the Solar System, none of which is exempt from serious criticism. However, when we reflect that about 100 million extra-galactic nebulae are accessible to observation[3] and that our local nebula, of which the sun is a member, has been estimated to contain something of the order of 100 thousand million stars,[4] it would perhaps be unwise to be too dogmatic about the matter. Nevertheless, if we are inclined to be intimidated by the mere size of the universe, it is well to remember that on certain cosmological theories there is a direct connexion between the quantity of matter in the universe and the conditions in any limited portion of it, so that in fact it may be necessary for the universe to have the

[1] I have taken the hypothetical inhabitants of Mars as an example, since we have a convenient word by which to denote them, but very few astronomers would admit the possibility of the higher forms of life on any of the planets or satellites of the Solar System (see e.g. W. M. Smart, *The Origin of the Earth*, ch. iv). If there are inhabited bodies they are probably to be found in other parts of the galactic system, or in the extra-galactic nebulae.

[2] *The Nature of the Physical World*, p. 178.

[3] Cf. G. J. Whitrow, *The Structure of the Universe*, p. 127.

[4] Ibid., p. 24. Sharp, op. cit., suggests about 50,000 million.

enormous size and complexity which modern astronomy has revealed, in order for the earth to be a possible habitation for living beings.[1] It will thus be well for us to keep a perfectly open mind on the question of the existence in the universe of rational corporeal beings other than man.

Furthermore, even if such beings exist, man may, for all we know, be the only corporeal creature who has fallen and who needs redemption; Mr C. S. Lewis has made play with this notion in his novel *Perelandra*. Again, if they have fallen, the conditions both of fall and of redemption may be radically different from those that apply in the case of man. Even in man the relations between the individual and the species is highly mysterious; the fact of original sin is undeniable, but its adequate formulation is the despair of theologians. In order to produce a really tidy theory of both man's fallenness and his redemption, it would be necessary not merely to know, as we do, that the human race is a metaphysical unity but also (as we do not) what precise sort of metaphysical unity it is, and precisely how the individual man is related to the universal manhood which is particularized in him. If even our knowledge of man is so limited and obscure, how much more limited and obscure must be our knowledge of other rational species. But at least we have no reason to suppose that the relation of the individual to the species in a non-human rational corporeal being will be exactly the same as that relation is in man; the solidarity of martians, both in fall and redemption, may be very different from that of men. It may or may not be such as to require an incarnation of the Son of God in martian nature. It may be well to remember that St Thomas Aquinas held that, even in the case of man, God *might* have worked redemption in some other way, though he held that the method of the incarnation was by far the most suitable one.[2] There may or may not be somewhere in the universe rational beings other than man. If there are, they may or may not have fallen. If they have fallen, their redemption may or may not require that the Son of God should become incarnate in their nature. God may or may not have some other way of restoring them to fellowship with himself; he may perhaps have an even more wonderful way, of which we cannot form the remotest conception. Whatever may be the truth about this, I would at any rate repeat my suggestion, that I cannot see any conclusive theological objection to the view that the divine Word may have become incarnate in other rational species than our own. There is, however, one final point on which some comment is needed.

Both St Paul and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews lay great stress upon the fact that, by his incarnation, the divine Word has, not only as God but also as man, acquired supremacy over the creation of God. God, says the Epistle to the Ephesians, made Christ to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named,

[1] I am indebted for this point to an unpublished paper by Dr G. J. Whitrow.
[2] *S. Theol.*, III, i, 2.

not only in this age but also in that which is to come.[1] By the incarnation of the Son of God, the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us, man has received the fulfilment of God's promise, the promise that man should be set over the works of God's hands and that all things should be put in subjection under man's feet.[2] Is this teaching compatible with the view that an incarnation of the Son is possible in any other rational species than man? There is, it must be admitted, a difficulty here, but it is perhaps relevant to observe that the argument of both Ephesians and Hebrews rests upon the unquestioned, but also unformulated, assumption that there are no corporeal rational beings in the universe other than man. Is this assumption to be taken as being part of the deposit of faith or not? I find it very difficult to give a confident answer to this question. If, for the sake of argument, we can assume that the essential point is not the subjection of the material world to man as such, but its subjection to whatever rational corporeal creatures there may be (remembering that it has been commonly held that it is precisely by his possession of rationality that man bears upon himself the image of God and has been given dominion over the lower creation on this earth), it might well be held that the restoration of the true ordering of the universe involves the personal union of the divine Word with *all* rational corporeal natures that exist, and not only with the nature of man. Is it, in fact, man alone or a whole family of rational creatures that is to rule over God's world as God's vice-gerent? This is the underlying question, and, on whichever side our personal preferences may lie, I do not see that we are in a position to answer it with certainty.

This has been a highly inconclusive discussion, but I do not think it has been altogether pointless. It has perhaps shown how wide is the liberty that Christian orthodoxy leaves to intellectual speculation, and how many are the avenues that it opens up. Theological principles tend to become torpid for lack of exercise, and there is much to be said for giving them now and then a scamper in a field where the paths are few and the boundaries undefined; they do their day-by-day work all the better for an occasional outing in the country. Outings, however, are outings and work is work, and it is very important not to confuse them with each other.

E. L. Mascall.

Great Pastors—VIII. Dean Hook

The sixth edition of the Life and Letters by his son-in-law contains a portrait of Hook at the age of sixty-nine. It says much. He might have been found among the Innocents whom Dante saw in the beginning of his vision: —

> Persons with grave and tranquil eyes, and great
> Authority in their carriage and attitude.

---

[1] Eph. 1. 20, 21. [2] Heb. 2. 7, 8.

"I looked at it" (an earlier portrait), his biographer wrote, "with increasing interest year by year, as I gradually understood who the subject was; how he was Vicar of a very large and smoky town, far away in the north; how he had built a great church there, what thousands of people flocked to it, what beautiful music was sung there, what eloquent sermons he preached, how deeply he was beloved by his people; and then, again, how full of mirth he was, what funny letters he wrote, and what droll things he said and did." "I am a jolly, fat old fellow", he said in 1868. He stands, indeed, in a great succession of jolly men.

Walter Farquhar Hook was born on 13 March 1798 and died on 20 October 1875, the eldest child of the Rev. James Hook, a man of literary aptitude, and his wife Anne, a woman of insight and character. He appears to have inherited neither the musical nor artistic accomplishments of his paternal grandparents. School days were not happy. His seven years at Winchester were rendered tolerable only by the presence of his lifelong friend William Page Wood, later Lord Hatherley. At Oxford he was miserable.

His career would make simple reading in Crockford's. Christ Church, 1818–21; ordained deacon, 30 September, 1821, in Winchester College Chapel, by the Bishop of Hereford; priested, Christmas 1822; Curate of Whippingham, I.O.W., 1821–6; perpetual Curate of Moseley, Birmingham, 1826–9; Vicar of Holy Trinity, Coventry, 1829–37; Vicar of Leeds, 1837–59; Dean of Chichester, 1859–75. The bare bones of his achievement can be hinted at in a few lines: a school and penitentiary built at Moseley; an Evening Institute, dispensary, and school founded, and church life revived at Coventry, with Sunday-school pupils multiplied from 120 to 1200; 21 churches, 23 parsonage houses, 27 schools built, and the parish church rebuilt at Leeds at a cost of £28,000.

Warmth, colour, variety; realism, vigour, integrity, and single-minded simplicity, all on a liberal scale—these are the permanent impressions of his character. "The one great characteristic of his course", Lord Hatherley wrote, "was in all things reality." Boisterously natural, he was unashamed of his tastes, which he held should be cultivated. Country he loved, and thought one loved it more as one became more christianized. His boyish admiration for England helped him considerably in Leeds. He loved each parish, all his work, and above everything Ecclesia Anglicana, which he called "the best and purest church" since apostolic times. His notion of happiness was to do what came to one's hand with all one's might.

Home came high in his scale of values; and he owed much to his wife's level-headedness, rousing him from depression and checking his impulsiveness. A good wife he regarded as a means of grace intended by God to soften man's heart. She was a stern critic both of herself and her husband. The joy he found with her was probably the secret of his abounding fun—"my little wee bit of a wife", he called her, together with incurable generosity of mind, heart, and pocket. He loved and needed friends, literary and otherwise, and came much under their influence: his mother, Wood, and Bishop Jebb, "his

Gamaliel"; Pusey, Newman, and "that apostolic man" Keble; Shakespeare, Milton, and Wordsworth among poets, the last through a personal connexion; Kant and Butler among philosophers; Jane Austen among novelists.

His devotional habits were not conventional. He prayed best walking in his garden—"indeed, I am generally peripatetic in my devotions"—reading the Bible till he gradually sank off into a holy reverie; otherwise, à Kempis, Andrewes, Bishop Wilson, and Law fed his soul. "The one thing necessary", he wrote, "is mystical union with Christ."

His capacity for friendship made him an interesting and sometimes amusing judge of men and movements. "Poor old Latimer was an honest fellow, but no divine", he wrote in 1842. "Irvingism", he said, "is High Church run mad." "Affection without discipline is the sin of Methodism." His Lives of the Archbishops, though spoilt by moralizing, are written from the unusual angle of one who expected soon to meet the men he judged.

In all things he was forthright. To do what he thought right to the glory of God he considered the only recipe for peace of mind and consistency of conduct. "I have been for thirty-two years the mastiff of the Church", a fair estimate of himself. His dislike of Dissent, both Papist and Protestant, drew forth the remark of Bishop Wilberforce that Hook was like a ship at anchor, which, though stationary, swings round to present its breast to the tide. The heart warms to the man who can say he had never known a public meeting not do harm. His frown, though terrible to curates, he could never maintain; and of bearing malice he was incapable.

Sensitiveness and the strong desire to be loved he counted as faults for which he valued abuse as a corrective. Like other energetic men, he felt himself tempted to laziness. Though ambitious for distinction and a bishopric in youth, he realized later that his vocation was not to the latter. Nor was he without idiosyncrasies. Foreigners he cordially hated; while death and hereditary clergymen he dreaded about equally. His mutterings in church must have delighted the choir. Less fortunate was his failure to appreciate the Tractarians in later days. St Saviour's certainly provoked him; but his quarrel with Pusey, with whom he was not reconciled till the end of his life, makes sad reading.

The previous owner of the writer's copy of his Life and Letters writes in the margin: "he was in after life an ideal *English* Churchman". "It is indeed", his biographer wrote, "in the variety of his powers, as well as in the force of character stamped upon all he said and did, that his chief claim lies to be called an extraordinary man. He was at once an active pastor, an eloquent preacher, a laborious student, a voluminous letter-writer, an able historian, a witty humorist, a wise practical moralist, an earnest Christian, an ardent patriot, and, every inch of him, a sturdy Englishman."

The many-sidedness of his parish policy is easier to grasp than his character. Its ruling purpose was to bring men to a need for grace and to union with Christ. In method it was governed by his concept

of the priesthood as essentially a teaching ministry. "Our grand hope under God", he wrote to Newman in 1835, "must rest with a learned clergy." His prodigious reading among the Fathers was closely geared to the aim of expounding and implementing Catholic faith, feeling, and tradition. Personal qualities apart, his greatness rests upon his faithfulness to the conception of the parish clergy as theological middlemen, retailers in divinity preparing men by easy explanation, of which he was a master, to understand the great men, such as Pusey, to whom they act as pioneers. Hence his system, instituted at Leeds, of weekly class meetings, at which the Bible or Liturgy was expounded and his own tracts on Anglican principles supplied for distribution to those who desired them.

His sermons exemplify the principle clearly; and while some are turgid, it is no accident that "Popery refuted by Tradition" is among the most effective and readable. Yet, despite the pains he took with them, he did not regard preaching as the first consideration: they were means of instruction, not grace. Sympathy and the pastoral habit he put first. "The very worst training a man can have is . . . a town parish. The strong pastoral feeling is generated in the country, and I attribute what little success I have had entirely to my country breeding." "I doubt", he wrote, "whether a clergyman can become a good pastor without sympathy." The proper conduct of all services and the faithful catechizing of children, whom he called "the first and grand consideration", he thought best calculated to make men love the truth.

He preached four or five times weekly at Coventry and Leeds. By 1847 he was preaching every night in Lent except Saturday, usually on the Bible, the Prayer Book, or Catholic custom; rising at four or five for the purpose; and spending the rest of the day visiting, interviewing, lecturing, baptizing, marrying, and burying, his usual quota of sleep being four and a half hours, and his only holiday Saturday evening. He thought sermons should encourage, and not simply rage against vice. One sermon a week for a busy man of average ability he considered enough. Preach as you speak; don't be controversial; and preach the truth before attacking error, was his recipe. Into correspondence he concentrated his most effective teaching and counsel. His letter of advice, in 1825, to a young man of business in whose technical knowledge he had found gaps must have been a shattering blow to that young man's pride.

It was his custom not to manage the parish but to let the parish manage him, by inculcating principles and letting them work, so that initiative seemed to come from the laity. He saw that if the Church did not touch the working classes she was doomed. Hence the grand strategy of his work was "one pastor for every poor man, and one school for every poor child". This is the thought behind the Leeds Vicarage Act of 1844, whereby his sprawling parish was divided into thirty districts. The same care for the hard-pressed won his powerful support at this time for the Ten Hours Bill, at a cost of considerable unpopularity among local mill-owners, some of whom belonged to his congregation. From the same source came a no less practical

scheme, inaugurated in 1838, known as the Society of the Friends of the Sick. The members, carefully chosen by the clergy, were to read the Bible to the sick and perform any other good works suggested. They prepared the sick for Communion and met monthly at the vicarage.

It would be misleading to portray him distracted by activity. He carried an inhuman load with a calm which derived from a thoroughgoing doctrine of the Spirit. "The cure of 20,000 souls", he wrote, in 1835, "would not be . . . more arduous than 9,000 . . . in either case it is impossible to attend to them all, and God does not require impossibilities at our hands. I should feel then as I feel now, 'All that the Father giveth to me will come to me'; and there will be a special providence over those who are prepared to embrace the means of salvation, and either they will be led to me, or I to them. It is the fault of the present day, to think and to act as if man could do everything, and certainly to forget God's special Providence."

"I failed as a pastor, I failed as a preacher, and I shall fail as a writer", he wrote in 1868. "Your work", Bishop Lonsdale wrote in 1859, "is without a parallel, or anything like a parallel in the ministry of our church." In 1858 his wife summed him up perhaps more faithfully: "Your great success has been owing to your great powers of sympathy and spiritual knowledge of the working of men's hearts, and . . . where you have failed, has been where you have lost your sympathy, and thought of yourself more than of others. You have had a life of great trial, but when I recollect what the Church was thirty years ago, and what it is now, and remember how you then seemed alone to hold the principles to which she owes her revival, I cannot allow that your work has been in any degree thrown away."

The only full account is to be found in *Dean Hook, His Life and Letters*, by W. R. W. Stephens, published by Richard Bentley. The first edition appeared in 1879, the sixth in 1881.

There is a short article by Gordon Crosse in the New (Third) Edition of the *Dictionary of English Church History*, edited by Ollard, Crosse, and Bond, published by Mowbray, 1948.

His correspondence with Pusey may be seen in Liddon's *Life of Pusey*, in three volumes.

There are references to him, not always favourable, in Dean Burgon's *Lives of Twelve Good Men*.

Twenty-six of his sermons were published in two volumes by Bentley in 1876 under the title *The Church and Her Ordinances*. The first, a Visitation Sermon preached in 1822 at Newport, is a miniature Assize Sermon before its time.

The Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury are from Augustine to William Juxon, and are in twelve volumes, the last containing indices only. The first volume, published by Bentley, appeared in 1860.

J. K. Byrom.

The Eucharistic Sacrifice

In the very interesting and valuable discussion of this subject between Mr Scott and Canon Balmforth the latter, as it seems to me, deals with the linguistic evidence in rather too summary a manner. It is no doubt true that "philology alone will not solve the problem". We need to reach an understanding of the points at issue upon the

theological level, and both articles have made a notable contribution to that. Nevertheless, the exact meaning of the words of Holy Scripture, if that can be determined, in passages relevant to the problem is clearly of crucial importance; and I think Mr Scott was right to begin by discussing at some length the interpretation of the words *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν*, although I cannot concur in his conclusion. This note attempts a contribution to the discussion merely upon the "philological" level.

Mr Scott contends that *ἀνάμνησις* has in Scripture only its normal Greek meaning of an "act of remembrance or recalling": he considers it to be a "mistaken idea that there is a God-ward reference in the word". But even if that were so we should still have to ask whether "to remind yourselves of me" would be a possible translation of *εἰσ την ἐμην ἀνάμνησιν*, regarded simply as Greek, although Canon Balmforth has done well to remind us that almost anything may yet prove to be possible in the "Koine"!

It is, however, clear enough on all grounds that we have here to deal with "translation Greek", and it is the Biblical antecedents of *ἀνάμνησις* (which are fixed and known) that most concern us. Here the facts are as follows.

The word *ἀνάμνησις* occurs only four times in the LXX. One of these instances is the passage Lev. 24. 7 which Mr Scott discusses. Of this he writes, "but the whole passage in the LXX is mistranslated and differs widely from the MT". Now, the difference between the Hebrew and the LXX is certainly striking, but it hardly seems to affect the point at issue. The Massoretic Text as rendered by the R.V. runs "Thou shalt put pure frankincense upon each row for a memorial, even an offering made by fire unto the Lord". Here the memorial (*'azkarah*) is identified with the "offering made by fire" (*'ishsheh*). From the direction given in Lev. 2 in connexion with the Meal-Offering it is clear that this memorial, or "reminder-portion", signifies that part of the offering which was burned on the altar and ascended in smoke to God on behalf of the giver "as a practical *memento mei* to Jehovah" (vide Kiel and Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Pentateuch* ad loc.). It is this word which the LXX, in the passage under discussion, renders by *ἀνάμνησις*: the Hebrew *w' hay' thah lallekem l'azkarah* is rendered as *ἔσονται εἰς ἄρτους εἰς ἀνάμνησιν*, which seems a perfectly good translation (the plural is accounted for by the "salt" which the LXX has introduced into the ritual from some unknown source). The words following *προκείμενα τῷ κυρίῳ*, are certainly a variation on *'ishsheh la 'Yahveh*: why the translator has introduced it is not clear: possibly, as Mr Scott suggests, he was confused by the fact that no part of the shewbread (unlike the meal offering) was burned, but only the incense: but this does not affect the point that *'azkarah*, with all that it connotes, is here rendered by *ἀνάμνησις*. Indeed it is difficult to see what meaning or relevance *ἀνάμνησις* in the sense of "an act of remembrance or recalling" could have in this context.

The second instance is found in Num. 10. 10, which has to do with the ritual blowing of trumpets: "ye shall blow with your trumpets over your burnt offerings and over the sacrifices of your peace offerings: and they shall be to you for a memorial before the Lord". Here *ἀνάμνησις* renders the Hebrew *zikkaron*, a word which, like *azkarah*, is normally rendered by *μνημόσυνον*, and is often a sacrificial term, but, unlike *'azkarah*, is equivocal, and not infrequently signifies a memorial day (Ex. 12. 14), or a memorial usage (Ex. 13. 9), or a memorial object (Josh. 4. 7) intended to remind *men* of something. But in this passage (where it is rendered by *ἀνάμνησις*) it is expressely stated that the trumpet blowing is "to be to you a memorial before God". Clearly the trumpets are thought of as calling the Lord's attention to the needs (see verse 9) or offerings of his people.

The two remaining instances of *ἀνάμνησις* in the LXX occur in the titles of the Psalms 38 and 70. Here it renders the Hiphil, or causative mood, of the verb *zakar*, "to remember": and *l'haz'kir* (R.V. margin "to make a memorial") appears to signify that the purpose of the psalm which follows is to entreat the attention of the Lord to the penitence or distress of his servant.

It seems, therefore, that whereas *μνημόσυνον* is used sometimes to signify a "memorial" which is a reminder to God, and sometimes one which is to serve as a reminder to men, the word *ἀνάμνησις*, on each occasion of its use in the LXX, has exclusively a "God-ward reference" sc. It stands for something which is to serve as a "*memento mei* to Jehovah" (cf. Isa. 62. 6 and 7). In the New Testament the only instance of its use, other than in the Eucharistic passages, is Heb. 10. 3—"in those sacrifices there is a yearly remembrance of sins" *(ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν)*, and the reference here is clearly to the annual Day of Atonement prescribed in Lev. 16 (note in particular ver. 21). The total number of instances is, of course, small; but, so far as they go, they all point to the conclusion that *ἀνάμνησις*, in Biblical usage, is definitely a ritual, or liturgical, term.

In the Eucharistic passage (1 Cor. 11 25) the conclusion is strengthened by the fact that the whole context consists of "sacrificial" terms. "The New covenant in my blood" inevitably recalls Ex. 24. 8. The words *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε*, in such a context, would themselves have ritual overtones: for *ποιεῖν* in the LXX renders the Hebrew *'asah*, a verb which signifies "do" or "make" in a quite general sense, but often acquires from its context the meaning of "perform a rite" or "offer a sacrifice": and in Matt. 26. 18 we have a clear instance of the use of *ποιεῖν* in this sense of performing a liturgical rite—*πρὸς σὲ ποιῶ τὸ πάσχα*, "in thy house I make the Passover". In fact it might be said that every one of the words of institution is steeped in liturgical and sacrificial associations, and the disciples could hardly fail to conclude from them that the Lord was instituting a rite which, however little they understood it at the moment, was in some way analogous to the sacrificial rites to which, as devout Jews, they were accustomed. In point of fact, St Paul in the preceding chapter (1 Cor. 10. 18–21)

draws a fully conscious and deliberate parallel between partaking of the Eucharist and partaking in the sacrifices of "Israel according to the flesh", or of pagan worship.

I have tried to confine myself to setting out what seem to be matters of fact, or which at least must be argued as such, quite objectively. How they are to be interpreted theologically is another matter. In this final paragraph, however, I venture to make the assertion that if the Eucharist is to be understood as that which in the worship of the Church of the New Testament fulfils, and supersedes (v. Heb. 13. 10?), the sacrificial rites of the Church of the Old Covenant (and in the light of the evidence of St Paul, the early Fathers, and the early liturgies, I do not myself see how it is possible to evade that conclusion), yet it is to be undersood not as the sort of sacrifice by which men are reconciled to God, but as that sort of sacrifice which is offered by men who are already reconciled to God. The sacrament in which the individual is, so to speak, brought within the range of that reconciliation which was once and for all effected in Christ representatively and generically is not the Eucharist but Baptism (vide 1 Cor. 6. 11—note the aorists): and if it becomes necessary to renew that reconciliation, that is done in Absolution. The Eucharist is essentially the rite in which the Church, reconciled to God ἐν χριστῷ, identified herself with the whole "intention" with which her High Priest "offered", and offers, his manhood to God, in his own flesh, and in her, as his mystical Body.

STEPHEN BEDALE, S.S.M.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Telfer is Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge.

Dr Mascall is a Lecturer in Theology in the University of Oxford and Student and Tutor of Christ Church.

The Rev. J. K. Byrom is Vicar of Cheadle Hulme, Cheshire.

The Rev. Stephen Bedale is a member of the Society of the Sacred Mission at Kelham.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE SHORTAGE OF CLERGY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

There has been a great deal of discussion during the last few years about the shortage of clergy; it would not be denied that this shortage coincides with a time in which the country has become once more a mission field, so that the number of officers of the Church Militant has fallen just at the time of need. At the same time, in the same difficult years, we are more dependent for our security on our

armed forces than ever before in peace and find it more difficult than ever to obtain the requisite number of regular soldiers.

The military answer to the problem has been increased reliance on the Territorial Army. True, we have conscription and compulsory part-time National Service afterwards; but the backbone of the T.A. is made up of the volunteer element, whether ex-N.S. or of the older generation of Terrier, and this volunteer cadre provides the bulk of the officers, warrant officers, and senior N.C.O.s. Now, however good their training during their whole-time service, this must continue in the T.A. and in particular their training as officers and N.C.O.s. This is achieved by tuition from a minute proportion of Regulars reinforced by experienced Territorials and spread over the year by evening drill nights, weekend camps, and annual (fortnight) summer camp.

How is this relevant to the problem of the Ministry? Simply that it is my contention that the solution to this problem lies in a properly trained part-time Ministry, a Territorial Clergy. I cannot see why journalism and pedagogy should be the only occupations compatible with the exercise of Anglican Orders, and I am convinced that there are many suitable laymen in the Church who could be ordained after proper selection and training and could then give most valuable service in their respective parishes working with and under the full-time clergy.

I shall be told that lay readers are the answer, but that is not true. Without in any way wishing to detract from their service, it must be recognized that the problem of adequate staffing of the parishes is only touched by the existence of lay readers, partly of course by the limitations on what they may do. Moreover, because of these limitations, and for other reasons, many or most of those I have envisaged as Territorial Clergy are not attracted to become lay readers. And further, it should be remembered that the adoption of a scheme such as I am adumbrating would produce more, not less, candidates for this office.

Again, I shall be told that if they have so much vocation the men I have in mind should go to a theological college for a year and become ordained full-time clergy. Such a reply is quite unrealistic: those who can, do so already. Others have families and other commitments which make it impossible, and usually also have a real interest in and vocation for their lay calling also. Why should this be all right for a journalist but not for an engineer? For a schoolmaster but not for a scientific civil servant? Furthermore, if we could get them all, could we pay for them?

I shall be told that cost would rule out my proposals. But, over all, they should result in increased manning at lower cost. I shall be told that it would divert intending ordinands. On the contrary, I believe that some part-time clergy would volunteer for regular service; and if some intending ordinands came in that way with some commercial or industrial experience behind them, it would be a net gain. I shall be told there must be no lowering of standards. But it is of the essence of my scheme that the men are properly selected. They would

mostly be rather older men than the majority of ordinands and with their experience of life should be easier to select than youngsters.

The details would naturally take time to work out fully. As a preliminary suggestion—and it must be understood that this is very tentative and not fundamental to the idea—I suggest that the training period be three years and that during each the training should consist of thirty evenings, two or three week-end retreats, and a fortnight in the summer at a specially arranged course at a theological college. A fortnight allows the candidate an opportunity in most cases of a short holiday with his family; longer precludes this. Otherwise the numbers are open to revision.

The evening courses, until such time as part-time clergy could help give them, would be an additional duty on some of the diocesan clergy, perhaps on some of the cathedral staff, but numbers would be small at first and as they grew the first ones would begin to ease the overall load on the clergy. Incumbents would get some extra work of a tutorial nature, but in a few years would reap their reward. Diocesan Retreat Houses are usually least needed at week-ends, and I am sure the principals of theological colleges would co-operate.

As a former Territorial C.O. I know it works in the army. As an Anglican layman I believe it would in the Church: may we not try to work out something on these lines?

Yours faithfully,

EWEN M'EWEN.

3, ADELINE GARDENS,
NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE, 3.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

May I urge that in order to relieve the present shortage bishops would give permission to any men sufficiently qualified as to education, status, and moral and spiritual life, to read Mattins and Evensong in their parish churches without preaching? This would keep the faithful together and they could come and join in prayer and praise and maintain the worship and witness of the Church. Some of these men when they had gained confidence would take the usual examination and qualify for a Reader's licence; some would pass to the diaconate and some again to the priesthood.

Yours, etc.,

S. P. T. PRIDEAUX.

THE HOUSE CHURCH

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In his article in your May issue Mr Southcott referred back to the theological kite that I flew some four years ago and to which you were kind enough to give anchorage in your number of August 1950.

Since Mr Southcott's article appeared I have spent a long week-end in his parish at Halton, Leeds, seeing the visions of which I then dreamed the dreams. As we each started, about the same time, from very different points of view—I from the needs of New Testament theology, he from the pressures of a parish—it might conceivably be of interest to readers of THEOLOGY to share the second thoughts which the combination has evoked.

I shall not attempt to describe what I saw at Halton, except to say that one found the Church living at a level at which it can seldom have lived since the days of the Acts. The breaking of bread from house to house and the rediscovery of the *ecclesia* of God in all its fullness at basement level—these can be described only by sharing in them and by listening to the unaffected testimony of men and women who owe to them their knowledge of Christ and a churchmanship, vivid and articulate, often concealed from the wise and prudent.

In isolating the fact of the house Church, one must never forget that in Halton this is issuing out of and feeding into the life of a vigorous parish Communion and parish Meeting, itself integrated into the life of the diocese (how often, as here, is the Bishop's name the first thing one reads on the church notice board?). The real significance of this experiment is that it is not a new form of congregationalism, but basic episcopacy. But, confining discussion to the Church in the house, I would pick out three things which look to be emerging of permanent significance for the Church as a whole. None of them is new, but each is coming with the force of an experienced fact, more potent than any amount of theory.

(*a*) The first is a living experience of a *form* of the Church different from that which most people in this country have ever actually known. And it is a form which compels those who find themselves within it to face questions which other levels of Christian living still allow them to evade. When there *is* no Church to *go to*, one *can* only *be* the Church. At this level there is a new constraint both towards mission and towards involvement in Christ. One cannot ignore either the house next door (there is no "next door" to the parish Church) or the Christian next to one (the parlour is very different from the pew).

In this form of the Church, too, the challenge of disunity comes with fresh force. When most of the *superficial* differences disappear and men of the same household still find themselves divided, the "why?" and the "how long?" press with more insistent reality. At the same time there is being built up in the house Church something much less vulnerable to disintegration from *without*. In the event of persecution the Church does not have to go underground: it is underground, even if the superstructure has to go.

(*b*) The second thing that is being discovered is the meaning of holiness. By uniting the words "holy" and "common", hitherto defined as opposites, Christianity created something entirely new, and by that juxtaposition the religion of the Word made flesh stands or falls. By taking the Holy Communion from the sanctuary to the scullery, the "offence" of Christian holiness is once more made unequi-

vocal. Is a consecrated building the only "right" place for the Sacrament? That is instinctively felt by those who still doubt the house Celebration. But all who have shared in it are unanimous that in fact nothing of reverence is lost, but rather that henceforth the most common is sensed as holy. "I now feel my house is really a bit of God's world"; "I can't just chuck my things around anyhow in this room now"; "We find we can't quarrel over the table on which the Holy Communion has been celebrated." The relation of work to worship no longer appears as the necessary integration of two foreign things.

The *forms* of this newly found holiness, the media through which at this level Holy Comunion is most naturally expressed, have still largely to be discovered. But if it is to have a chance of spontaneous growth it must be allowed its own liberty. As I see it, it will be a pity if those in authority, from caution or administrative tidiness, apply here the canons of liturgical expression on which they would rightly insist for the parish Eucharist.

(*c*) The third question that is being thrown up is the nature and future of the ministry. On many other grounds—of manpower, economics, and evangelism—the need for a supplemental non-professional ministry is gaining recognition. Indeed, in some form this seems inevitable if the Church of England is not to be in for an indefinite period of retrenchment. The real fear is that nothing will be done till it is economically inescapable. That will only prove the Marxists right and deprive the Church of any spiritual advantage she might reap from it.

The significance of the house Church is that it raises this question precisely in the right form and with immediate urgency. It shows a new type of ministry to be a necessary requirement of the normal (parochial) form of the Church's mission and not merely of evangelistic adventures that might (very wrongly) be dismissed as side-lines or stunts. It shows the real need to be not more assistants at the parish Church (lay readers, permanent deacons, etc.), but breakers of bread, priests, of indigenous Churches. The urgency can be stated quite simply by saying that from this month Halton will be without a single assistant priest. A movement of the Spirit like this, because it is fully catholic, is bound always to be tied to the ministry: must it be constantly at its mercy?

The compass of a letter prevents one from stating the principles or making the qualifications which are necessary to guard against misunderstanding. The experiment is full of dangers and shortcomings, of which those are most conscious who are most deeply quickened. But I should like to put on record for what it is worth—and I measure my words carefully—that I believe this development of the Church in the house to be the single most important new thing that is happening in the Church of England to-day.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN A. T. ROBINSON.

CLARE COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.

GREAT PASTORS—THOMAS WILSON

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

When Thomas Wilson became chaplain to the Earl of Derby, his lordship's family seat was at Lathom Hall, near Ormskirk. The chapel of St John-the-Divine where Wilson officiated, built as a chantry chapel in 1499, is still in regular use.

Amongst the chapel's possessions is a printed copy of a sermon preached there on 17 June 1707—ten years after he had left to become Bishop of Sodor and Man. The sermon is said to have been preached at five other places in England, and if preached as printed would have lasted nearly two hours. Its subject was "The Danger of Living in Known Sin".

Yours faithfully,

SPENCER W. WILSON.

THE VICARAGE,
HAYDOCK,
ST HELENS, LANCS.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE SOURCES OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS, Vol. I. St Mark. By W. L. Knox. Cambridge University Press. 21s.

As readers of THEOLOGY are aware, Mark has recently had something of a field day.[1] Mark and John are the two Gospels which attract most attention, partly perhaps because they both present important and unsolved problems. The problem that Dr Knox examines in this posthumous work is an old one, but it has taken on a new appearance since the studies of the form critics.

The form critics abandoned the older quest for written sources and attempted to demonstrate two things—first, that the arrangement of material in Mark was mainly the evangelist's doing, and, secondly, that the material itself was with little exception analysable into small disconnected units. These units the evangelist took over from oral tradition and put them in the order which best served his purpose in writing the Gospel. Many of the form critics felt themselves able to explain nearly everything in the Gospel in terms of these two constituents: the oral tradition providing the unrelated units and the evangelist devising their order.

Almost from the beginning this view of the Gospel was modified in two directions. First, the evangelist was allowed to have received some of his material in larger entities, either in collections such as Mark 2. 1–3. 6 or in the continuous narrative of the Passion story. Secondly, it was suggested that the evangelist did not depend entirely on his own invention for the order of his material but made use of a summary of the career of Jesus, and that many of his units had some kind of indication of their position in this career. As a result of these

[1] Cp. Dr R. P. Casey's review article in THEOLOGY, October 1952.

two modifications the evangelist's share in determining the order of his material was much restricted.

Such were some of the conclusions reached about the substance and structure of Mark at the time of Dr Knox's work on the Gospel, and his volume must be studied against these conclusions. He had planned two volumes: the first, before us, on the sources of Mark, and the second on the sources of Matthew and Luke. The first volume seems to have been left in a finished, or almost finished, condition and it will be treated in this review as the form of his work intended by the author as final.

Dr Knox was well read in the works of the form critics, but he preserved his independence. As the title of his book indicates, he is concerned not with the irreducible units into which the Gospel is divisible, but with entities intermediate between these units and the Gospel as a whole. He claims that these entities exist and are important for any explanation of the Gospel. In this direction he is not satisfied with the picture the form critics present even after the two modifications reported above. Dr Knox has harked back to Eduard Meyer's argument that Mark had written sources at his disposal. He does not accept Meyer's theory of sources in its every detail, but he takes it as his starting-point. In particular he thinks that Meyer's "Twelve" source represents "a definite step forward". He also recognizes one of the evangelist's sources in Mark 13, another in the Passion story, and accepts Albertz' suggestion that another source provided Mark 2. 1–3. 6. He is critical of the suggestion that we have a second group of conflict stores in 11. 15–12. 40.

So much Dr Knox owes to his predecessors. On the foundations they provide he develops a theory of at least nine sources in the Gospel. In addition to the documents mentioned above there is "a 'book' of parables", 4. 1–34; "the death of the Baptist", 6. 16–29; "the Corban story", 7. 1–23; "a 'book' of localized miracles", 7. 32–7, 8. 22–6, and 10. 46–52; and "a denunciation of the Pharisees preserved in Luke 11. 37–52 and Matt. 23. 1–6, elaborated out of the fragment Mark 12. 37b–40 with some genuine material". Besides these he suggests other sources but with less confidence.

In Dr Knox's argument certain things are noticeable. First, there is no real discussion of criteria whereby sources are discovered and delineated. Thus we find that sometimes Mark refers to "The Twelve", at others to "his disciples" or some such phrase. Likewise we find that Mark uses "Jesus" frequently to 2. 19 but only once, 3. 7, between 2. 19 and 5. 6, and again only twice, 6. 30 and 8. 27, between 6. 4 and 9. 2. The name is not used between 9. 27 and 10. 5 nor perhaps between 11. 33 and 12. 24. It is used once, 13. 5, between 12. 35 and 14. 6, and once, 15. 15, between 15. 5 and 15. 37.[1] Now, Knox has employed the references to the Twelve as a source criterion, but not the use or disuse of the name, Jesus. He may be right in doing so, but some discussion of why he used certain criteria and discarded others would have been welcome.

[1] "Jesus" is probably an insertion at 8. 17; 9. 39; 12. 17; 13. 2; 15. 34.

Secondly, we would have liked this theory to have been related to Mark's language. This is a uniform and individual idiom whose consistency is in striking contrast to what we find in Luke-Acts. Linked with this might have been a justification of the view that the author was using documents rather than depending on oral tradition. In general we might think oral tradition more at home in the Semitic-speaking world and a written tradition more at home in the Greek-speaking world, but what are we to think about an evangelist whose Greek is so Semitic? There are, of course, other considerations to keep in mind as well.

Thirdly, there are many apt references to the practice of ancient historians, and Dr Knox has found Tarn's study of sources in his *Alexander the Great*, II, inspiring and rightly so. While we are in his debt for many parallels and illustrations, we may wish that he had also drawn on sources less formed by the Greek tradition of history. For example, had he turned to the Lives of Pachomius as often as he had turned to Josephus, he would have been able to illuminate his study of the composition of Mark from the transmission of a tradition which probably is most closely parallel to that of the Gospels. As it is, we may feel that Dr Knox is too dominated by the Greek tradition.

Fourthly, there is Dr Knox's suggestion that Luke in the Passion story has used Mark's sources as well as Mark. In principle there is nothing improbable in such a suggestion. Any source, immediate or remote, may have contained an account of which one derivative document presents only a fragment, while another retains the fuller form of the original. But in this instance it seems easier to explain the relation between Mark and Luke along either of two other lines. Either Luke has freely rewritten Mark and supplemented it with various fragments, or he has conflated Mark and another continuous Passion story. I prefer the former hypothesis myself, but I think either more defensible than Dr Knox's suggestion.

Dr Knox has given us many acute and helpful discussions in the book. There are the very salutary comments on theories about the original form behind Mark 2. 1–12 on page 11. He makes the interesting suggestion that *ἀποστοματίζειν*, Luke 11. 53, means "cross-examine". As we might expect, Dr Knox continued to maintain that the evangelist had not intended to end his Gospel at 16. 8. The footnotes do not dominate the book as they do some of Dr Knox's books, but they are not to be neglected.

To conclude, the book is more stimulating than convincing. We cannot read it without feeling that we have gained by doing so, but we cannot rest content with the solution it presents. It instructs us, but much more it makes us think. It is to be hoped that the author would have been happy in this fruit of some of his last labours. Those who know or read his books will feel that it makes little difference to their indebtedness whether they agree with this or that conclusion.

G. D. Kilpatrick.

Oxford.

THE IRONY OF AMERICAN HISTORY. By Reinhold Niebuhr. Nisbet. 15s.

PRINCIPALITIES AND POWERS. By E. Gordon Rupp. Epworth Press. 7s. 6d.

Time magazine, in reviewing the first volume of Dr Niebuhr's Gifford Lectures, remarked, in the best one-sentence summary of his theological aim that I have encountered, that Dr Niebuhr had set himself to test and prove the truth and relevance of the Christian faith in every sphere of human life. (This being so, it is perhaps not surprising that he should be so often better understood by an ably conducted "secular" journal such as *Time* than by the usual reviewers of the American "religious" press.)

As a young minister in Detroit in the twenties, he had been unforgettably impressed by the contest between the realities of power in that city and the idealistic phrases in which they were cloaked; and had been saved from cynicism only by the encounter also with other aspects of human life which are the happy lot of the parish minister. The record of those years was published as *Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic*; and this theme, spiritually the deepest contribution Dr Niebuhr has to make to our preaching, our praying, and our dealing with men and policies, runs through his book, developed, elaborated, and refined. In the last chapter of the present book irony is distinguished both from tragedy and from pathos, and defended not as a subjective pattern imposed upon history by the imagination of the student, but as the true Christian interpretation. "Elements of irony, tragedy, or pathos may, of course be detected in life and history without any guiding principle of interpretation. . . . But a basic faith . . . will determine which of these three is regarded as the most significant frame of meaning for the interpretation of life as a whole. . . . The Christian preference for an ironic interpretation is derived not merely from its conception of the nature of human freedom, according to which man's transcendence over Nature endows him with great creative possibilities which are, however, not safe against abuse and corruption. It is also derived from its faith that life has a . . . divine source and centre (which) must be discerned by faith because it is enveloped in mystery. . . . So discerned, it yields a frame of meaning in which human freedom is real and valid and not merely tragic or illusory. But it is also recognized that man is constantly tempted to overestimate the degree of his freedom . . . and become involved in pretensions which result in ironic refutations of his pride. . . . Consciousness of our ironic situation tends to dissolve it. It may be dissolved into pure despair or hatred . . . or into the experience of contrition and to an abatement of the pretensions which caused the irony" (pp. 144–5).

From this standpoint, the origin, achievements, and present dilemmas of the American people are examined in a spirit which is remarkably like that of the good pastor on the challenges presently facing his parish, and the various foibles of his flock.

American history is intrinsically so interesting, and her present

dilemmas so inextricably involved with our own, that these pages are nearly as important and valuable for ourselves as for the citizens of the U.S.A. They include some fruitful observations on political theory, with especial reference to the doctrine of the separation of powers in government; an excellent analysis of the religious character of the Communist movement in Asia and the peculiar difficulties it presents to the West; and numerous characteristic *obiter dicta*. (These last are to be treated, in spite of their manner of presentation, as a sort of scientific generalization: even where they are not certainly true, reflection upon them is fruitful.) The study of these pages should reduce the amount of crude anti-American prejudice to be found among us; considerably deepen our understanding of the role which we and the Americans alike face; and serve to prepare us for the dangers and temptations which specially await those who are called to withstand the Communist movement.

Mr. Rupp's slighter and easier book, based on four lectures in the B.B.C. Third Programme, sets forth the failure of nerve by which we are commonly beset as we confront the contemporary principalities and powers, and the source of faith, hope, and love by which the fear of them may be overcome because the Lord has triumphed over them. It is enriched by quotations and illustrations drawn from Mr Rupp's studies in Luther and the Wesleys; and an Anglican may be permitted to add that the book's immediacy, while due partly to the urgency of the theme, and partly to Mr Rupp's natural liveliness of style, seems to owe something also to the thorough training in technique of presentation which is characteristic of Methodist preaching.

Birmingham. David M. Paton.

T. R. Glover. By H. G. Wood. Cambridge University Press. 21s.

Well Remembered. By C. M. Blagden. Hodder and Stoughton. 15s.

Dr Wood's admirable biography and Bishop Blagden's autobiography might well be read in alternate sittings. The reader would swing from Oxford to Cambridge, from Anglicanism to Dissent, from Hellenism to Hebraism, from Humanism to Catholicism, and though no doubt Truth would still elude him, he would have enlarged the boundaries of his mind and the range of his sympathies. The two subjects were near-contemporaries whose lives and labours cover a wide range of interest and activity, academic and ecclesiastical, philosophical and theological. When all is said, is it not true that the half-century 1900–50 is by far the most important for the historian whether his theme is the movement of thought or institutional reform and innovation? The period is also perhaps the least familiar, being too far off for personal experience and too near for the history books. Glover's, for instance, was a name to evoke enthusiasm or hostility in the twenties and early thirties; yet already he, like many far greater men, is half-forgotten and *The Jesus of History* is hardly to be mentioned in respectable circles. Yet that small volume repre-

sents a phase of English theology which ought not to be forgotten if present tendencies are to be firm grounded and current questions adequately answered. How he "dates" too in his political Liberalism—anti-Gladstonian, anti-Home Ruler, a Liberal Imperialist who but for his antipathy to the Church would have had no quarrel with Toryism; he did in fact vote for Larmor, the Conservative candidate at Cambridge, in 1911. Yet he would not or could not see what one of his heroes, Mr Joseph Chamberlain, had seen about the time of Glover's birth: that political Nonconformity was on the way out. His fellow Baptists were naturally proud of him—he served as president of their Union in 1923–4—but even within the denominational field Glover's dislike of bishops, not to add of priests, creeds, and dogmas, provoked much controversy, notably with J. H. Shakespeare, the secretary of the Union, who in Glover's eyes was too ready to sell the pass in the matter of episcopacy. And it was not only on Reunion that Glover found himself out of step with his own brethren. Perhaps it is one moral of this interesting biography that to become a don is to embark upon a dangerous occupation. Baulked of his aspirations to the professoriate—he put in for both the chairs of Ancient History and of Ecclesiastical History—and refusing after much dubiety more than one offer from America, Glover declined in morale; ambitious and restless, querulous and quarrelsome, sensitive to criticism while himself militant and provocative, he retreated to his tent at St John's College, emerging chiefly to refresh himself by preaching and lecture tours in Canada and the States.

His biographer finds partial explanation in the vile climate of Cambridge. Perhaps Oxford dons are happier, if not better, men. Peradventure the examinations are easier or the regulations simpler! Or perhaps Claude Martin Blagden was less of a fighter and more of a philosopher. Perhaps with his clerical home, his public school, his Anglican upbringing, he was more at home at Corpus and Christ Church. Certainly Blagden was more at heart a humanist, for whereas Glover (except when writing of ancient Athens) had little or no interest in wine and song, music and drama—scarce would he allow his adolescent daughters to see *Peter Pan*—Blagden rejoiced in these and all other innocent aids to the good life. Not that his own academic career was without its trials, disappointments, and injustices, arising out of the inefficiency or carelessness of colleagues and superiors. He remembers and comments severely upon some dons of his youth and tells some almost incredible tales (pp. 114, 121) of lapses from duty and from ordinary courtesy. "Lewis Carroll" for instance *qua* don was not a nice man. And there were many others. The connoisseur in Oxford autobiography of this same period—such as the *Memoirs* of Oman, *The Short Journey* of E. L. Woodward, the *Fifty-Five Years* of G. B. Grundy—will be able to add ample additional illustration of the selfish and superior antinomianism which is one of the subtle dangers of donhood.

In 1912 Blagden left Oxford to become rector of Rugby; thence in 1927 he moved to Peterborough. And here, again, the obvious gentleness and goodness of the narrator's nature should ensure attention

to the adverse comments upon deans, canons, country clergy (and even bishops) flourishing long after 1912 (e.g., pp. 221, 236, 240, 275, 278). And that surely is as it should be; not everything in every garden is lovely; there are always patches of weeds, ragged edges, and overgrown paths, not to be overlooked by the faithful steward. But the tartness is no more than the bite of a small quince in a large and luscious apple pie. The crust too is there—the wisdom and practicality and piety of the pastor and administrator in those decades of reform following "Life and Liberty" and the new machinery in province and diocese and parish. *Well Remembered* will be treasured as a picture book. And how lovely the pictures are—Newnton Longueville and the rectory in the seventies, London in the eighties, Bradfield School and the Berkshire woods, Christ Church Hall at evening in the winter terms, the fen country and the churches of the Nen valley, the Palace at Peterborough and its garden in spring, and, over all, the Cathedral joining the unreal present to the vivid past as memory held open the door upon the vista of a long, useful, honourable and happy life.

Britford Vicarage,
Salisbury.

W. G. Addison.

Spiritual Authority in the Church of England. By Edward Charles Rich. Longmans. 21s.

This is a book designed to contribute to the debate begun by Newman's *Prophetical Office of the Church* and continued by his *Development of Christian Doctrine*, a debate involving some of the most important and most difficult issues facing Christian theologians to-day—the meaning of Tradition, the teaching organ of the Church, the Infallibility of the Church, the relation of the Church to Christ, the Inspiration of the Bible, and the place of reason in religion. The author would no doubt describe himself as an Anglo-Catholic, but he has none of the narrowness sometimes associated with that name. His writing gives evidence of wide reading, of great fairness of judgment, and of a determination to think through his subject honestly according to his lights. The last chapter, which admirably summarizes the not altogether clear argument which has preceded it, outlines a solution for the issues involved in his subject. It is his conviction that God intends his Church, ideally at least, to possess an infallible power of deciding what is Christian truth; that this power can be seen in the past to have operated, before the schism between East and West, and that the organ of this infallible judgment will eventually be found to reside in some combination or inter-relation of three principles, the Papacy, the Collective Episcopate, and the body of the faithful (p. 183). In the course of arriving at these conclusions Canon Rich has provided food for thought for minds of every shade of conviction within the Anglican Communion.

One may, however, legitimately doubt, on the evidence offered by the text, whether the author was, in spite of his genuine fairness and honesty, altogether well prepared for tackling such a subject. His

reading appears to be wide but not deep. He gives no evidence at all of having read Salmon's *Infallibility of the Church*; no doubt he would have strongly disagreed with it, but not to have read it argues himself—not very well equipped. The work might have led him to recognize the almost insuperable difficulty of ascribing infallibility in any circumstances to a recognizable historical institution. Canon Rich's authorities, too, seem to be almost all secondary. He relies, for instance, for most of his information about Protestant thought in the seventeenth century on Tulloch's *Rational Theology and Christian Philosophy* (p. 42, n. 1). When he deals with the Early Fathers (a most important source on this subject, and one in which both Newman and Salmon were deeply read) he is content to quote the conclusions of other authors; had he read them for himself (or even any recent work, such as J. N. D. Kelly's, on the creeds), he would not have endorsed the quite erroneous statement of C. H. Dodd that "out of the Rule of Faith the Creeds emerged" (p. 87).

In a short review it is impossible adequately to comment upon Canon Rich's conclusions. Two points only can be noted: First, his doctrine of Tradition is in essentials that of the modern Roman Church, which is distinctly different from Newman's doctrine, though the author does not observe this. Tradition, he says, does not consist of dogmatic statements, but of "a living experience conditioned by the faith and worship of the faithful believers in Christ" (p. 180), and this tradition apparently interprets Scripture; and he appears to endorse Fr Congar's statement, "The past may be known by the fact of the present; the present is not determined by a reference to the past" (p. 205). We are convinced that this theory in fact ends by cutting the moorings of the Christian faith with history. Second, though he can write a note (p. 112) on "Christ Incorporate with his Members" with which every Anglican should cordially agree, he does not seem to have given careful enough thought to the complex and critical suject of the relation of Christ to his Church. That is all that we can conclude from such statements as "whatever is true of the Person of Christ should *ideally* be equally true of his Body" [the Church] (p. 179), and from the extraordinary theory which we meet in the pages of this book of a "memory of Christ's Body" which the Church is supposed to possess and from which it can apparently fish up such odd recollections as the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and the Corporeal Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary (pp. 149–54, 189). It was precisely because the Church possessed no such memory that the New Testament was written.

Canon Rich's work is a gallant little bark afloat on a wide and dangerous sea of theology; but it does not, perhaps, carry quite enough guns.

R. P. C. Hanson.

The University of Nottingham.

LIFE IS COMMITMENT. By J. H. Oldham. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

ECLIPSE OF GOD. By Martin Buber. Gollancz. 15s.

ESSENTIAL CHRISTIANITY. By William E. Wilson. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

The publishers are correct in describing Dr Oldham's book as "a piece of reasoned Christian apologetics", if apologetics is, as Brunner says, answering the questions the outsider addresses to the Church. The task of apologetics, however, has in our time been called in question from an even more distinguished quarter, and though an abler or better-informed apologist than Dr Oldham could hardly be found, it is easy to see in his book the danger menacing all apologetics, that beginning by answering the unbeliever's questions may easily lead to letting the unbeliever set the terms of the conversation, with the result that the right questions—those God puts to man—are never asked, and the faith is presented as a philosophy or myth. Dr Oldham draws on Buber in the attempt to show the reality of the personal sphere of life, and that man is essentially a being who lives in community with others; life is fundamentally encounter, dialogue. From thence, through a profound treatment of atheism, we reach the idea of God as the one who is always subject, who cannot be objectified, with whom we are to live in the dialogue of prayer. It is in the chapter on Christ that the danger of the apologetic method becomes most apparent. Dr Oldham endeavours to take his stand beside the unbeliever and to look for links between the latter's experience of life and the faith of the creeds. Here his compassion seems to have parted company with his theological judgment, and he fails, it seems, to see that only *from in Christ* can he truly stand beside the unbeliever at all, and that his task is to present Christ not as the explanation of present experience but as the creator of a new basis for experience. This seems, at least, to be the explanation of his approval of Streeter's heresy that we must be prepared for Christ's sake, i.e. for what he stood for, to give up Christ. But the true reason why we must not be afraid of historical criticism is not that Christ stood for the truth but that he is the truth, even though he may be a scandal to the intellect. The chapter on the Church begins promisingly indeed with the author's confession that Christianity has no meaning at all for him without the Church, but that the Church as it actually exists seems to be the source of all his doubts and difficulties. How many will echo that! But the latter part of the chapter fails to distinguish the Church as the sacramental embodiment of redemption (neither "sacraments" nor "redemption" nor the verbal equivalents appear in this chapter) from the empirical community of sinners, and so inevitably reaches the position that some people need not join the Church—the change of environment would be bad for their healthy growth! No doubt this is the natural corollary of what has been said about Christ. On "the world" the author is in a field where he is second to none; nevertheless his position on ethical decision leaves me unsatisfied. The publishers advertise this book as a study in existential theology. Our comment must be—existential, but not

existential enough. Dr Oldham represents a tendency becoming common to-day to combine a liberal view of the relationship of faith and philosophy with an existentialist position in philosophy. This is the existentialism of the existentialists, not that of Pascal and Kierkegaard, which is the unconditional adherence of the whole man, *intellect* and will alike, to Christ. For, to the New Testament, life is not "commitment", but Christ.

Martin Buber needs no commendation from the reviewer. In view of his present popularity in Christian thought, some theological question marks seem more evidently necessary. *Eclipse of God* is a study of modern thought, especially in its atheistic aspects, against the background of the author's philosophy of "I and thou". Nietzsche, Kierkegaard, Heidegger, Sartre, and Jung all come under penetrating scrutiny. The two main themes of the book are the eclipse of God in modern atheism as the destruction of inadequate images of the imageless God who can only be known in the "lived concrete", and the relation between religion and ethics, in which connexion Christianity is criticized for devaluing ethics in favour of religion; this criticism is focused in a careful study of Kierkegaard's idea of the teleological suspension of the ethical. Buber is a master, and we must not refuse to learn from him. But he is a liberal Jew, and a philosopher, not a theologian; though he works from within the Biblical tradition, he seriously misunderstands Christianity, possibly because he seems to judge it by German pietistic Lutheranism. It is not true, for example, to say that Christianity replaces the covenant relationship with a people by Hellenistic individualism, and what he interprets as the devaluation of ethics for the sake of religion is really a consequence of the priority of grace over law. Buber is a "Pelagian" as well as a syncretist, and Christian theology cannot use his ideas without correction in Christ. But because their ultimate source is in fact the revelation in the Old Testament, they are capable of such correction. It remains to say that Buber is surely right in seeing in Jung's gnosticism a far greater enemy to faith than critical atheism.

Mr Wilson, who is a member of the Society of Friends, is one who believes that the way to reunion lies in discarding as accretions those elements in the faith of other churches which seem superfluous to a liberal Protestant. It is difficult to see the value of publishing more books upholding this thesis, which has been decisively rejected by the ecumenical movement itself.

WENDOVER. WILLIAM NICHOLLS.

SHORTER NOTICES

THE SPIRIT OF LOVE. By C. F. Kelly. Longmans. 21s.

"Be moderate in all things except love"—how characteristic this is of the teaching of St Francis de Sales! There can be no counterfeit or pretence in Christian love. It is based upon the knowledge, constantly increasing and growing, of the amazing love of God revealed in Christ. It is a knowing of the love of Christ "which passeth know-

ledge". Our worship, devotion, and prayer is our response in the power of the Holy Spirit to that love. In short, we are concerned always with God's glory. Mr Kelley quotes the story told by Archbishop Temple. "I have prayed and striven long", said a penitent to a saint, "and yet I have failed. How can I pray better?" "Go home," was the saint's reply, "and pray for God's glory."

St Francis de Sales addressed his teaching, not only to monastic communities, but also to those living in the world, beset with daily tasks and duties. The idea that the devout life could be lived in the world as in the monastery was a novel one at the time and in the climate of opinion when St Francis wrote. "Do not think", said St Francis, "that our Lord is far from you while you are in the midst of the bustle and pressure of affairs called for by your vocation and that were you in the delights of a tranquil life this would not be so. No, such is not the tranquillity which draws him near. Not the feeling we have of his sweetness, but the loyalty of our love, and the welcome we give to the accomplishment in us of his holy will and of our will in him, is what most attracts him." We have to learn the lesson each moment brings. "Every moment", says St Francis, "comes to us pregnant with a command from God, only to plunge into eternity, there to remain for ever what we have made it." This attitude he calls "holy indifference". He does not mean by this an acquiescence in injustice and wrong, for these things must be contrary to God's will. It is not resignation, but a willing of God's will.

Mr Kelley has given us a most helpful exposition and discussion of the teaching of St Francis de Sales, setting forth not only the doctrine but also the practical application. He quotes extensively and judiciously from the Saint's writings, and hopes thus to encourage the reader to search the treasures himself.

LIVERPOOL. O. R. CLARKE.

THE EDUCATION OF SOULS. By Reginald Lumb. Faith Press. 6s.

Canon Lumb's book is a fine attack on the intellectual or "notional" view of religious education to be found both within the Church and outside it. In its place he pleads for a true education of souls which will build them up in grace and truth, not only to know about God but to know him and love him and serve him. Like most impassioned attacks or pleas, this is at times repetitive and blind, even annoying, yet it must carry a good deal of conviction, for we are patently producing little or no result from much of our teaching of both children and adults. We are merely producing people who think they have "done" Christianity like any other school subject, when, in fact, they have never done anything about it in conduct, let alone prayer and worship. At the same time we are overlooking the work of the prime educator of Christians, the Holy Spirit.

The plea of this book is for a Christian education presented in a whole-hearted sacramental scheme, but not without due explanation

according to capacity: Canon Lumb has some pertinent remarks about the contents of syllabi. It is high time that the goodwill and interest in Christian education produced more effective Church membership, but that can only come through priests and teachers: it will be good if many of them read this book forbearing its annoyances, and recast their teaching accordingly. They might well go on to read a kindred work, Fr Gibbard's *Tomorrow's Church*. Rather strangely Canon Lumb does not mention it; perhaps it is too much an official publication for his liking, though it thoroughly supports and usefully expands his pleas.

TOTTENHAM. J. H. CHURCHILL.

JESUS, MASTER AND LORD. By H. E. W. Turner. Mowbrays. 21s.

JESUS, LEADER OF MEN. By G. W. Butterworth. Religious Education Press. 8s. 6d.

Among the generalized works on the Four Gospels published of recent years, Professor Turner's new book is quite outstanding. Intended for theological students, teachers in schools, and working clergy and ministers, it deserves to be regarded by all three as indispensable reading.

The plan of the book carries us with balanced purposefulness through a brilliant survey of what modern scholarship has to say concerning the Gospels. Not one really significant issue of current interest is left unnoticed, and the best authorities are invoked with unfailing skill at every point. One may not necessarily agree with Professor Turner's arbitration between his authorities in every instance, but one could certainly wish for no more scrupulously fair presentation of their respective cases, even where their conclusions are rejected.

The author makes no claim to great originality in this work, but it is much more than a mere conspectus of Gospel criticism during the last fifty years. For the theological student, graduate and non-graduate alike, it should prove to be a sound basic textbook for his Gospel studies, and a valuable guide in selecting literature for further reading. For those whose training lies behind them, its value will be in its lucid presentation of the most recent trends of Gospel criticism and exegesis. Very few books are so completely adjusted to the findings of the last few months before its publication as this one. The bibliographies at the end of each chapter are appropriately brief, thoroughly discriminating and pungently relevant to the needs of the type of reader envisaged.

In so admirable a work, it is probably ungrateful to point to blemishes. Professor Turner nevertheless seems to be on unwontedly insecure ground in his dealing with the admittedly intractable problem of the "Messianic Secret"; there are three or four instances of unintelligible references; and there is only one, unduly short, general index which by no means does justice to the text, a defect which one

will hope to see remedied in later editions. The book merits many editions.

In sharp contrast to this, it is hard to see why Dr Butterworth's book need have been written at all. It is a colourless, "liberal" biography of the human Jesus, ignoring almost all that has been said and written in the name of scholarship for the past forty years, adopting a typically patronizing attitude to the writers of the Gospels and hazarding innumerable baseless conjectures concerning our Lord, his message and his contemporaries. If we really do need yet one more Life of Jesus, which seems doubtful, then it must be of more solid stuff than this.

HUCKNALL. E. W. TRUEMAN DICKEN.

ENGLISH AND SCOTTISH PSALM AND HYMN TUNES (c 1543–1677). By Maurice Frost. S.P.C.K. and Oxford University Press. £5 5s.

Here is a book, long overdue, very much needed, and of absorbing interest to all lovers of these grand old psalm and hymn tunes. That this book will be the standard work on the subject for a long time to come is evident the more one studies it, and it is clear that many years' careful planning and detailed research have been involved. The author says: "I hope the material here collected will be of use to other workers with more opportunities for consulting sixteenth- and seventeenth-century books; who will be able to add to the references, and correct the errors." He also adds that he has endeavoured to give the tunes exactly as they were printed—errors included. That being so, we need not be surprised to find odd misplacements of notes, and queer-sounding harmonic progressions, of which there are a good many. Obviously a wide field of speculation is opened up, which should prove an engaging study for musicologists and others who have the time and leisure to devote to such things; and we may hope in time to know how and why such errors have crept in.

Meanwhile let us be thankful that such a book is now available; that it is so clearly and beautifully printed, and so fully annotated.

THE CLOISTERS, W. H. HARRIS.
WINDSOR CASTLE.

PLOTINUS AND NEO-PLATONISM: An Introductory Study. By P. V. Pistorius. Bowes and Bowes, Cambridge. 21s.

"The three hypostases of the Neo-Platonic Godhead are not a gradation of three separate beings, as is generally supposed", writes Dr Pistorius, "but a more intimate trinity than that of Christian theology." Plotinus, it is claimed, was the first thinker to realize that God could not be "a barren unity without multiplicity or movement . . . God is One-in-many". The result of this recognition was "one of the richest and most logical conceptions of ultimate reality ever found in any theological or philosophical system".

This original thesis challenges more than one accepted position.

To begin with, it questions previous interpretations of Plotinus. While mentioning in his text important disagreements with previous writers, including Dr Inge, the author says that the terms of his research precluded further discussion. The need for such discussion, however, is indicated, for large questions are raised. And they are questions which concern the Christian theologian to-day. More particularly, there is the question of the ground of the doctrine of the Trinity. Is it a truth grounded in Revelation alone, as many would claim? If Dr Pistorius is right, then this claim cannot be maintained, unless, maybe, the associated concept of Revelation is modified.

Even if we agree that Plotinus does, in fact, provide successful philosophical demonstration of the basic concept of the Trinity, the further question arises whether his concept is indeed "a more intimate trinity than that of Christian theology". This statement seems to assume an agreement in Christian interpretation and exposition which does not exist. And it could scarcely be maintained, to take but one example, against the recent exposition by Fr Taymans d'Eypernon.

We may suspect at times that his own zeal for lucidity has led Dr Pistorius to suggest a fidelity to a logical pattern which Plotinus himself did not manifest. A test question in this connexion is Plotinus' treatment of the problem of Evil. In a discerning chapter, Dr Pistorius rightly affirms that a basic consideration here is the Plotinian concept of *matter*. Rejecting the conclusions of Schröder, Edward Caird and Inge, Dr Pistorius claims that Plotinus is thoroughly consistent and nowhere illogical or dualistic in his examination of the problem.

While welcoming this stimulating exposition of "the apostle of Platonism" whose work has had such a profound influence on Christian theology, we may hesitate to accept an interpretation which claims such consistency for so great a seer.

McGill University, Montreal. R. H. L. Slater.

The Formation of the New Testament. By H. F. D. Sparks. S.C.M. Press. 13s. 6d.

Professor Sparks' aim in this book is to take as his "starting-point the origin, growth, and development of the primitive Christian Church" and then "to fit the books of the New Testament into their appropriate places in the story" (p. 13). The idea is a good one, and there is much in the way in which the author carries it into effect that is of interest and value to the student of the New Testament. The author is however so enamoured of his maxim that the New Testament is "the Church's Book" that he tends to deprive it of independent authority, transferring its authority to the Church. But the writers of the New Testament were not just the mouthpieces of the Church. They were men raised up by God to warn, teach and lead the Church with an authority that was given them not by the Church but by God.

In matters of detail also there is much that is questionable. In his treatment of critical problems the author creates the impression of accepting far too confidently solutions that are tenable indeed, but attended by difficulties of which he gives his readers little or no warning. Thus for instance he accepts the existence of Q as a *document*; the date of Galatians before the so-called Council of Jerusalem; the authorship of the Fourth Gospel by "another John" as "the most attractive" of the alternatives.

He misunderstands St Paul's paradox in his metaphor of the wild olive-branches grafted into the cultivated stem when he says "St Paul has got his metaphor the wrong way round" (p. 50, n. 131)—of course he has, but deliberately.

On p. 31 he confuses the girl with the spirit of divination at Philippi with Lydia, and on p. 90 appears to have misread Acts 17. 11 —it was at Berea, not Thessalonica, that they "examined the Scriptures".

PETERHOUSE, CAMBRIDGE. J. N. SANDERS.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK: F. H. Heinemann, *Existentialism and the Modern Predicament* (18s.).

BLACKFRIARS PUBLICATIONS: *Obedience* (Eng. trans. of *L'obéissance et la religieuse d'aujourdhui*) (16s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: E. C. Dewick, *The Christian Attitude to Other Religions* (25s.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS (for MELBOURNE UNIVERSITY PRESS): J. Stephen Hart, *A Companion to St John's Gospel* (12s. 6d.).

DESCLÉE DE BROUWER: P. Dumontier, *Saint Bernard et la Bible* (160 fr.).

EDINBURGH HOUSE PRESS: S. G. Williamson and J. Bardsley, *The Gold Coast: What of the Church?* (1s.).

ÉDITIONS DU SEUIL: André Rétif, *Introduction à la doctrine pontificale des missions* (n.p.).

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS (O.U.P.): Earl Morse Wilbur, *A History of Unitarianism* (48s.).

MACMILLAN: Vincent Taylor, *The Names of Jesus* (12s. 6d.).

NELSON: N. Micklem, *Reason and Revelation* (8s. 6d.).

PRESSES UNIVERSITAIRES DE FRANCE: M. Nédoncelle, *Introduction à l'Esthétique* (240 frs.).

REINHARDT (MUNICH): A. M. Schimmel (Ed.), *Oekumenische Begegnungen* (DM. 7.50).

S.C.M. PRESS: John Heath-Stubbs (Ed.), *Images of Tomorrow* (10s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: Cecily Hastings and Donald Nicholl (Editors), *Section I* (15s.).

SOCIETY FOR OLD TESTAMENT STUDY: Book List 1953 (5s.).

S.P.C.K.: T. S. Johnson, *The Story of a Mission* (8s. 6d.); J. G. Marash, *New Testament Mimes* (4s. 6d.).

S.P.G.: K. G. Symcox, *To All Men* [S.P.G. Annual Report] (1s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher